

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Atty Docket No 30004640-2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Colin Andrew LOW et al. **Confirmation No.:** 1504
Serial No.: 09/977,497 **Examiner:** El Hadji Malick SALL
Filed: October 16, 2001 **Group Art Unit:** 2457
Title: INVITING ASSISTANT ENTITY INTO A NETWORK COMMUNICATION
SESSION

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS

Sir:

This is an Appeal Brief in connection with the decisions of the Examiner in a Final Office Action mailed March 28, 2011, and in connection with the Notice of Appeal filed on June 28, 2011.

It is respectfully submitted that the present application has been at least twice rejected.

Each of the topics required in an Appeal Brief and a Table of Contents are presented herewith and labeled appropriately.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(1)	Real Party in Interest.....	3
(2)	Related Appeals And Interferences.....	3
(3)	Status of Claims.....	3
(4)	Status of Amendments.....	4
(5)	Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	4
(6)	Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal.....	7
(7)	Arguments	8
	A. The rejection of claims 1-3, 8-10, 12-13, and 17-19 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owen in view of Eichstaedt should be reversed.	8
	B. The rejection of claims 4-6, 11, 16, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owen in view of Eichstaedt and further in view of Brown should be reversed.	16
(8)	Conclusion	19
(9)	Claims Appendix.....	20
(10)	Evidence Appendix	26
(11)	Related Proceedings Appendix	27

(1) Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 11445 Compaq Center Drive West, Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A prior Appeal Brief was filed on November 21, 2005. In response to that Appeal Brief, the Examiner reopened prosecution of the present application on February 23, 2006. A second Appeal Brief was filed on February 22, 2007. An Examiner's Answer was issued on January 2, 2008 in response to the second Appeal Brief. The Appellants submitted a Reply Brief on February 27, 2008. A Decision on Appeal affirming the rejection of the claims was issued on June 14, 2010. A Request for Continuing Examination that amended the claims at issue was filed on August 9, 2010.

The Appellant is unaware of any other appeals or interferences related to this case.

(3) Status of Claims

Claims 1-20 are pending and stand rejected.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.37, the Appellant hereby appeals the Examiner's decision finally rejecting all of the pending claims to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. Therefore, the rejections of claims 1-20 of this application are appealed.

(4) Status of Amendments

No amendment was filed subsequent to the Final Office Action dated March 28, 2011.

A copy of the claims at issue on appeal is attached as the Claims Appendix.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Claims 1 and 17 are the independent claims in this appeal. It should be understood that the citations below to the original disclosure as providing support for the claimed features are merely exemplary and do not limit the claim features to only those citations.

Independent claim 1 recites a method of inviting an assistant entity (for instance, a customer service representative (CSR) 74) into an existing communication session (for instance, a session 11) established by a service system (for instance, a call-center management system 72) with an associated transport mechanism for the exchange of data across a network between endpoint entities joined to the session (12A, 12B, 12C) comprising the steps of:

(a) receiving a request from a first endpoint entity in the service system to invite an assistant entity into the existing communication session, wherein the assistant entity is configured to assist the first endpoint entity with a property of the existing communication session (*Specification*, page 53, lines 24-30);

(b) determining, by the service system, a context of the existing communication session based upon context data concerning the existing communication session (*Specification*, page 53, lines 24-30);

(c) selecting, by the service system, an appropriate assistant entity from a group of assistant entities based upon the determined context of the existing communication session (for instance, a group member as indicated in Figure 23); and

(d) joining, by the service system, the selected assistant entity to the existing session (Figure 23; *Specification*, page 53, lines 21-30).

Independent claim 17 recites a service system comprising:

a session entity (element 12) for establishing communication sessions and controlling the joining of endpoint entities to each such session (for instance, session 11) (*Specification*, page 7, lines 6-15);

a transport entity (for instance, session transport 15 and/or session transport manager 19) for establishing a transport mechanism for each session established by the session entity, the transport mechanism being arranged to allow the exchange of data across a network between endpoint entities joined to the session (*Specification*, page 6, lines 8-15);

request-reception means (for instance, session mediation server (SMS) 67) configured to receive a request from a first endpoint entity already joined to a session and constituted by a party having an endpoint system connected to the network, the request being arranged for requesting the presence of an assistant entity in the session and directly or indirectly indicating the identity of the existing communication session, wherein the assistant entity is configured to

assist the first endpoint entity with a property of the existing communication session (Figure 23; *Specification*, page 32, lines 9-18; page 53, lines 19-26);

context-determination means (for instance, contact center management system 72) configured to determine a context of an existing communication session between endpoint entities based upon context data concerning the existing communication session (*Specification*, page 53, lines 26-28) and

assistant-selection means (for instance, a CSM 69; *Specification*, page 31, line 30 through page 32, line 7; page 53, lines 26-30, and Figures 3, 6, 7, and 23) configured to be responsive to the receipt of said request by the request-reception means to select an appropriate assistant entity from a group of possible assistant entities based upon the determined context of the existing communication session, the assistant-selection means being operative to cause the session entity to join the selected assistant entity to the session (Figure 23; *Specification*, page 53, lines 26-30).

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

A. Whether claims 1-3, 8-10, 12-13, and 17-19 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,611,501 to Owen et al. (hereinafter “Owen”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,069,304 to Eichstaedt et al. (hereinafter “Eichstaedt”).

B. Whether claims 4-6, 11, 16, and 20 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owen in view of Eichstaedt and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,646 to Brown et al. (hereinafter “Brown”).

(7) Arguments**A. The rejection of claims 1-3, 8-10, 12-13, and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owen in view of Eichstaedt should be reversed.**

The test for determining if a claim is rendered obvious by one or more references for purposes of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is set forth in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007):

“Under §103, the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved. Against this background the obviousness or nonobviousness of the subject matter is determined. Such secondary considerations as commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, failure of others, etc., might be utilized to give light to the circumstances surrounding the origin of the subject matter sought to be patented.” Quoting *Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966).

According to the Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in view of *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, Federal Register, Vol. 72, No. 195, 57526, 57529 (October 10, 2007), once the *Graham* factual inquiries are resolved, there must be a determination of whether the claims would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art based on any one of the following proper rationales:

(A) Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results; (B) Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results; (C) Use of known technique to improve similar devices (methods, or products) in the same way; (D) Applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results; (E) “Obvious to try”—choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success; (F) Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art; (G) Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference

teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

Furthermore, as set forth in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, quoting from *In re Kahn*, 441 F. 3d 977, 988 (CA Fed. 2006), “[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasonings with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.”

Furthermore, as set forth in MPEP 2143.03, to ascertain the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue, “[a]ll claim limitations must be considered” because “all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385.

Initially, the heading of the rejection on page 2, reference number 2 of the Final Office Action incorrectly recites that only claims 17-19 are rejected because the main body of that rejection includes rejections 1-3, 8-10, 12, 13, and 17-19.

Independent Claims 1 and 17

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “receiving a request from a first endpoint entity in a service system to invite an assistant entity into an existing communications session, wherein the assistant entity is configured to assist the first endpoint with a property of the existing communication session.” Independent claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, “a request-reception means configured to receive a request from a first endpoint entity already joined to a session and constituted by a party having an endpoint system connected to the network, the request being arranged for requesting the presence of an assistant entity in the session and directly or indirectly

indicating the identity of the existing communication session, wherein the assistant entity is configured to assist the first endpoint entity with a property of the existing communication session.”

In independent claims 1 and 17, therefore, there is an existing communication session established by a service system for the exchange of data across a network between endpoint entities joined to the session. In addition, an assistant entity configured to assist the first endpoint entity with a property of the existing communication session is invited into the existing communication session. According to an example, the assistant entity may be invited into the existing communication session during a “shop with friends” browsing session as discussed on pages 52-55 of the present Specification.

The Examiner asserts that column 12, lines 9-15 of Owen discloses these features of independent claim 1 and 17. *Final Office Action*, page 3. Column 12, lines 9-15 of Owen recites:

A user agent 107 also receives and processes requests to join a service session from service sessions themselves. This is a form of in-coming call processing where another user has created a service session and invites the user to join in.

Owen defines a “service session” as a “single activation of a service. It relates the users of the service together so that they can interact with each other and share entities, such as documents or blackboards.” *Owen*, column 10, lines 60-63.

Although the above-cited section of Owen appears to disclose that a user is invited to join into a service session, that section does not disclose that an “assistant entity” as recited in independent claims 1 and 17 is invited to join into a service session. Instead, that section merely recites that a “user” of the service session is invited to join into a particular service session,

without describing what the “user” is. More particularly, that section of Owen fails to disclose that the “user” is an assistant entity that is configured to assist the first endpoint entity with a property of the existing communication session as recited in independent claims 1 and 17.

Clearly, therefore, the Examiner erred in asserting that column 12, lines 9-15 of Owen discloses the above-identified features of independent claims 1 and 17.

Likewise, therefore, the Examiner erred in asserting on page 3 of the Final Office Action that column 12, lines 4-15 of Owen discloses “selecting, by the service system, an appropriate assistant entity from a group of assistant entities” as recited in independent claim 1 and an “assistant-selection means configured to be responsive to the receipt of a said request by the request-reception means to select an appropriate assistant entity from a group of possible assistant entities of the existing communication session, the assistant-selection means being operative to cause the session entity to join the selected assistant entity to the session” as recited in independent claim 17. The Examiner erred in making this assertion because, as discussed above, the cited section of Owen fails to disclose that an “assistant entity” as recited in independent claims 1 and 17 is invited to join the existing communication session.

Also on page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that column 10, line 49 to column 11, line 61 of Owen discloses a “context-determining means configured to determine a context of an existing communication session between endpoint entities based upon context data concerning the existing communication session.” More particularly, the Examiner appears to assert that “services providing a context for relating activities” is equivalent to the “context-determination means” recited in independent claim 17. These assertions are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

In column 10, line 49-column 11, line 61, Owen defines the concepts of “session” and “access”. *Owen*, column 10, line 46. In addition, Owen discloses that “[a]lthough services by their nature are different from each other, they all have a common fundamental property in that they provide a context for relating activities. Such a context is termed a Session.” *Id.*, lines 52-54. The remainder of the above-cited section of Owen discloses various service specific services, none of which relate to determining a context of a session. Instead, and as discussed in lines 52-54, the “context” discussed in Owen is equivalent to a “session”, and thus, cannot reasonably be construed as being based upon context data concerning the existing communication session, as recited in independent claims 1 and 17. Clearly, therefore, the Examiner erred in asserting that the above-cited section of Owen discloses context-determination means configured to determine a context of an existing communication session between endpoint entities based upon context data concerning the existing communication session.

The Examiner correctly acknowledges that “Owen fails to teach explicitly selecting based upon the determined context.” *Final Office Action*, page 3, bottom. Although the Examiner failed to acknowledge this, Owen fails to disclose selecting “an appropriate assistant entity from a group of assistant entities based upon the determined context of the existing communication session” as recited in independent claim 1 and an “assistant-selection means configured to be responsive to the receipt of said request by the request-reception means to select an appropriate assistant entity from a group of possible assistant entities based upon the determined context of the existing communication session, the assistant-selection means being operative to cause the session entity to join the selected assistant entity to the session” as recited in independent claim 17.

In any regard, in attempt to overcome the above-described deficiency in Owen, the Examiner cites to column 3, lines 9-11 of Eichstaedt. *Final Office Action*, pages 3-4. That section of Eichstaedt recites “[t]he filter content could also be selected based on predetermined criteria, such as the context of the user’s session, transaction, or activity, the data being accessed, etc.” Eichstaedt is directed to web filler that can be used to alleviate the problems of long latency or delay periods on the internet, wherein the presentation of the filler content keeps the user occupied during the period of latency or delay. *Eichstaedt*, column 2, lines 58-61. In this regard, Eichstaedt fails to disclose selecting an appropriate assistant entity from a group of assistant entities based upon the determined context of the existing communication session.

As such, Eichstaedt does not overcome the deficiencies of Owen discussed above. For instance, Eichstaedt does not teach or suggest wherein the assistant entity is configured to assist the first endpoint entity with a property of the existing communication system. Moreover, Eichstaedt does not teach or suggest selecting, by the service system, an appropriate assistant entity from a group of assistant entities based upon the determined context of the existing communication session. Further, Eichstaedt does not teach or suggest joining, by the service system, the selected assistant entity to the existing session.

Accordingly, even assuming for the sake of argument that one of ordinary skill in the art were somehow motivated to combine Owen and Eichstaedt as the Examiner suggests, the proposed combination would still fail to result in each and every element recited in independent claims 1 and 17. In this regard, the Examiner has failed to establish that the proposed combination of Owen and Eichstaedt renders independent claims 1 and 17 *prima facie* obvious.

On page 11 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the “Applicant’s arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.” This assertion is respectfully traversed because, as noted above, the Appellants have clearly established that the proposed combination of Owen and Eichstaedt fails to disclose particular elements recited in independent claims 1 and 17.

The Examiner also asserts that the proposed combination of Owen and Eichstaedt discloses “selecting, by the service system, an appropriate assistant entity from a group of assistant entities based upon the determined context of the existing communication session.” Final Office Action, pages 11-12. This assertion is clearly erroneous for at least the reasons presented above with respect to the deficiencies in Owen and Eichstaedt.

The Examiner also asserts, in paragraph (C) on page 12 of the Final Office Action, that “Eichstaedt was not used to address such feature in the rejection as clearly shown on page 4 of the Office Action.” In response, the Appellants were merely pointing out that neither Owen nor Eichstaedt discloses an “assistant entity” as recited in independent claims 1 and 17.

The Examiner still further asserts, in paragraph (D) on page 12 of the Final Office Action, that the proposed combination of Owens and Eichstaedt render independent claims 1 and 17 *prima facie* obvious. This assertion is clearly erroneous for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 17.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Owen and Eichstaedt fail to render independent claims 1 and 17 *prima facie*

obvious. The Board is therefore respectfully requested to reverse the rejection of independent claims 1 and 17 and the claims that depend therefrom.

Dependent Claims 2, 3, 8-10, 12, 13, 18, and 19

Dependent claims 2, 3, 8-10, 12, 13, 18, and 19 depend upon one of allowable independent claims 1 and 17 and are thus allowable over the proposed combination of Owen and Eichstaedt at least by virtue of these dependencies. These claims are also allowable over the proposed combination of Owen and Eichstaedt for additional reasons.

For instance, in rejecting claims 2 and 18, the Examiner asserts that Figure 5 of Owen discloses that an assistant entity is a customer service representative and associated endpoint system. *Final Office Action*, page 4. Figure 5 of Owen, however, fails to even show a customer service representative. Instead, Figure 5 of Owen depicts a “User Agent Architecture”. Clearly, therefore, the Examiner erred in asserting that Figure 5 of Owen discloses the features of claims 2 and 18.

In rejecting claims 3 and 19, the Examiner asserts that column 5, lines 59-62 of Owen discloses that the assistant entity is a software-based entity with an associated knowledge base.” *Final Office Action*, page 4. Column 5, lines 59-62 of Owen recites “[a]n intelligent agent in this context can be broadly described as a software based entity which acts on behalf of another entity.” Thus, that section of Owen pertains to an “intelligent agent” that operates on behalf of another entity and not to an assistant entity. Clearly, therefore, the Examiner erred in asserting that the above-cited section of Owen discloses the features of claims 3 and 19.

With regard to claims 7, 14, and 15, the Examiner asserts that column 11, lines 22-23 and column 12, lines 4-15 of Owen discloses the features recited therein. This assertion is respectfully traversed because column 11, lines 22-23 of Owen discusses the creation of a user session and column 12, lines 4-15 of Owen discusses a user agent 107. In this regard, none of those cited sections in Owen discloses that a service system, in setting up a communication session, creates a service-session functional entity which in the course of joining said endpoint entity to the session, sends connection details of the transport mechanism associated with the communication session to the endpoint entity or its proxy then using the connection details to connect itself to the transport mechanism. Accordingly, the Examiner clearly erred in rejection claims 7, 14, and 15.

The rejection of claims 8 and 9 are also clearly improper because the Examiner has merely cited to various disclosures in Owen without providing any indication as to how those cited sections are being interpreted to reject those claims. *Final Office Action*, page 5. As such, the Appellants are at a loss as to how to respond to those rejections.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish that dependent claims 2, 3, 8-10, 12, 13, 18, and 19 are *prima facie* obvious based upon the proposed combination of Owen and Eichstaedt. The Board is therefore respectfully requested to reverse the rejection of these claims.

B. The rejection of claims 4-6, 11, 16, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owen in view of Eichstaedt and further in view of Brown should be reversed.

Claims 4-6, 11, 16, and 20 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 20 and are thus allowable over the proposed combination of Owen and Eichstaedt for at least the same reasons as set forth to independent claims 1 and 17 above. In addition, the Examiner attempts to rely upon Brown for its disclosure of the features of claims 4-6, 11, 16, and 20. As will become clearer from the following discussion, the proposed combination of Owen, Eichstaedt and Brown fails to render claims 4-6, 11, 16, and 20 unpatentable.

With respect to claim 4, the Examiner asserts that column 9, lines 5-9 of Brown disclose the features recited therein. *Final Office Action*, page 7. Column 9, lines 5-9 of Brown recites “Database 132, which could be a single database or a set of multiple databases, contains data for selecting a call center and determining ‘TAG2’ Web interaction information to accompany the call.” The accompanying of “TAG2” Web interaction information with a call, however, is not equivalent to a service system providing follow-me page-push functionality to the party endpoint systems whereby to enable co-browsing by the parties joined to the session as recited in claim 4.

With respect to claims 5 and 6, the Examiner asserts that column 3, lines 61-65 and column 14, lines 37-40 of Brown discloses the features recited therein. *Final Office Action*, page 8. Column 3, lines 61-65 discusses that that an agent is connected when an Internet user clicks a button to connect to the agent from a Web page and column 14, lines 37-40 recites “...the audio message relating to at least one of an identity of the user and details of the interactive communication session.” Thus, there is nothing in those cited sections of Brown pertaining to a context of an existing communication session comprising the subject of a web page currently being jointly browsed by the parties joined to the session service, as recited in claim 5. In fact,

there is nothing in those cited sections pertaining to a joint browsing of a web page by multiple parties.

In addition, therefore, the Examiner has not and cannot reasonably rely upon the disclosure contained in Brown to make up for the deficiencies in Owen and Eichstaedt discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 17.

Accordingly, even assuming for the sake of argument that one of ordinary skill in the art were somehow motivated to combine Owen, Eichstaedt, and Brown as suggested by the Examiner, the proposed combination would still fail to result in independent claims 1 and 17 or the claims that depend therefrom. As such, the Examiner has failed to establish that proposed combination of Owen, Eichstaedt and Brown renders claims 4-6, 11, 16, and 20 unpatentable.

For at least the foregoing reasons the Board is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 4-6, 11, 16, and 20.

(8) Conclusion

For at least the reasons given above, the rejection of claims 1-20 described above should be reversed and these claims allowed.

Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this Appeal Brief to deposit account no. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 29, 2011

By /Timothy B. Kang/
Timothy B. Kang
Registration No. 46,423
(703) 652-3817

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.
11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, VA 22030
(703) 865-5150 (facsimile)

(9) Claims Appendix

1. (Previously Presented) A method of inviting an assistant entity into an existing communication session established by a service system with an associated transport mechanism for the exchange of data across a network between endpoint entities joined to the session comprising the steps of:

(a) receiving a request from a first endpoint entity in the service system to invite an assistant entity into the existing communication session, wherein the assistant entity is configured to assist the first endpoint entity with a property of the existing communication session;

(b) determining, by the service system, a context of the existing communication session based upon context data concerning the existing communication session;

(c) selecting, by the service system, an appropriate assistant entity from a group of assistant entities based upon the determined context of the existing communication session; and

(d) joining, by the service system, the selected assistant entity to the existing session.

2. (Original) A method according to claim 1, wherein the assistant entity is a customer service representative and associated endpoint system.

3. (Original) A method according to claim 1, wherein the assistant entity is a software-based entity with an associated knowledge base.

4. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 1, wherein the data network is the internet, and the existing session has multiple parties connected to the data network through web browser functionality of associated endpoint systems, the service system providing follow-me page-push functionality to the party endpoint systems whereby to enable co-browsing by the parties joined to the session.

5. (Original) A method according to claim 4, wherein the context of the existing communication session comprises the subject of a web page currently being jointly browsed by the parties joined to the session service.

6. (Previously presented) A method according to claim 1, wherein in step (a) the first endpoint entity uses an active feature of a web page served by the service system to request that a assistant entity join the session.

7. (Previously presented) A method according to claim 1, wherein the service system, in setting up a communication session, creates a service-session functional entity which in the course of joining said endpoint entity to the session, sends connection details of the transport mechanism associated with the communication session to the endpoint entity or its proxy then using the connection details to connect itself to the transport mechanism.

8. (Original) A method according to claim 7, wherein the service-session functional entity comprises a session instance with generic behaviour for adding and removing endpoint

entities to the communication session and for recording the endpoint entities currently joined to the communication session, and an associated service instance with service-specific behaviour determining when the session instance is to add and remove endpoint entities.

9. (Previously presented) A method according to claim 1, wherein the service system, in setting up a communication session, creates a service-session functional entity that comprises a session instance with generic behaviour for adding and removing endpoint entities to the communication session and for recording the endpoint entities currently joined to the communication session, and an associated service instance with service-specific behaviour determining when the session instance is to add and remove endpoint entities.

10. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 1, wherein the transport mechanism associated with a communication session provides multiple data transfer channels, for different media types, between endpoint entities joined to the communication session.

11. (Previously presented) A method according to claim 10, wherein the endpoint entities include web browser functionality and the service system provides functionality, and the transport mechanism provides channels, for at least two of the following:

text chat;

follow-me page-push; and

packetized voice.

12. (Previously presented) A method according to claim 7, wherein the transport mechanism associated with a communication session provides multiple data transfer channels, for different media types, between endpoint entities joined to the communication session, the connection details passed to said endpoint entity or its proxy comprising details of the media channels associated with the communication session, and the endpoint entity or its proxy using these details to establish corresponding media channel connections to the transport mechanism.

13. (Previously presented) A method according to claim 7, wherein the state of connection of said endpoint entity to the transport mechanism is signaled to the session-service functional entity by leg messages passed between a leg controller of the endpoint entity or its proxy and a corresponding leg controller of the service-session functional entity.

14. (Original) A method according to claim 7, wherein the second endpoint entity or its proxy already has connection functionality for joining and participating in a communication session, the service-session functional entity of the communication session to which the endpoint entity is to be joined inviting this entity into the session by sending said connection details to the connection functionality of the entity or its proxy.

15. (Original) A method according to claim 7, wherein the service-session functional entity, in joining the first endpoint entity into the communication session, sends the latter both connection functionality for joining and participating in a communication session, and said connection details.

16. (Original) A method according to claim 15, wherein the connection details and functionality are sent in association with a web page served by the service system.

17. (Previously Presented) A service system comprising:

a session entity for establishing communication sessions and controlling the joining of endpoint entities to each such session;

a transport entity for establishing a transport mechanism for each session established by the session entity, the transport mechanism being arranged to allow the exchange of data across a network between endpoint entities joined to the session;

request-reception means configured to receive a request from a first endpoint entity already joined to a session and constituted by a party having an endpoint system connected to the network, the request being arranged for requesting the presence of an assistant entity in the session and directly or indirectly indicating the identity of the existing communication session, wherein the assistant entity is configured to assist the first endpoint entity with a property of the existing communication session;

context-determination means configured to determine a context of an existing communication session between endpoint entities based upon context data concerning the existing communication session and

assistant-selection means configured to be responsive to the receipt of said request by the request-reception means to select an appropriate assistant entity from a group of possible assistant entities based upon the determined context of the existing communication session, the

assistant-selection means being operative to cause the session entity to join the selected assistant entity to the session.

18. (Original) A service system according to claim 17, wherein the assistant entity is a customer service representative and associated endpoint system.

19. (Original) A service system according to claim 17, wherein the assistant entity is a software-based entity with an associated knowledge base.

20. (Previously presented) A service system according to claim 17, wherein the network is the Internet and the service system being arranged for providing follow-me page-push functionality to the party endpoint systems whereby to enable co-browsing by the parties joined to the session.

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 30004640-2
App. Ser. No.: 09/977,497

(10) Evidence Appendix

None.

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 30004640-2
App. Ser. No.: 09/977,497

(11) Related Proceedings Appendix

None.